

REMARKS

The above-identified patent application has been amended and Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and again examine the claims as amended.

The Applicants affirm the restriction requirement imposed by the Examiner without traverse and elect to prosecute the claims of Group I (Claims 1-7 and 18-22). Accordingly, the claims of Group II (Claims 8-17) have been canceled.

Claims 1 to 7 and 19 to 22 are pending in the application. Claims 1 to 7 and 19 to 22 are rejected. Claims 1 to 7, 19 and 21 are amended herein. Claims 8 - 18 are cancelled herein without prejudice.

Claims 18 and 23 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 10 and 23 of U.S. Patent No. 6,911,955. Applicants have cancelled claim 18. Applicants were confused with respect to claim 23 since the application does not include a claim 23.

The Examiner rejected Claims 3 and 4 and 7 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Applicants have amended the Claims with the Examiner's comments in mind and submit that the Claims are now proper under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

The Examiner rejected Claims 1, 3-6, 18-19 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Haggis et al. (U.S. Patent number 3,669,920). Claims 1-3 and 5-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Habib (U.S. Patent number 4,144,027). Claims 18 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Elmendorp et al. (EP Patent number 636472) and Cain et al. (US Patent number 3,673,611). The Examiner rejected Claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Habib (U.S. Patent number 4,144,027). The Examiner rejected Claims 19-21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable

over Habib (U.S. Patent number 4,144,027) in view of Cain et al. (U.S. Patent number 3,673,611).

Applicants submit that Claim 1, as amended, is patentably distinct over Haggis et al., Habib, Elmendorp et al., or Cain et al., in combination or individually, since the cited references neither describes nor suggests a fabric product comprising "a fabric layer having a plurality of fibers, the plurality of fibers impregnated by an impregnation compound with the fabric layer coated on each side with the impregnation compound, where the impregnation compound is derived from a mixture comprising: a pre-polymer; a co-reactant curative; and a diluent, said diluent solvating the mixture of said pre-polymer and said curative, and wherein said impregnation compound has a curative stoichiometry range of less than 85 percent" as set forth in Claim 1.

Claims 2 to 6 depend from and thus include the limitations of Claim 1. Thus, Applicants submit that Claims 2 to 6 are patentably distinct over the cited reference at least for the reasons discussed above in conjunction with Claim 1.

Applicants submit that Claim 7 is further patentably distinct over the cited references, since Haggis et al., Habib, Elmendorp et al., or Cain et al., in combination or individually neither describes nor suggests "wherein the ratio of said curative to said pre-polymer is derived from the formula $\frac{6.34 \times 0.75 \times 230}{42}$ = parts by weight of curative per 100 parts of pre-polymer where the pre-polymer comprises an isocyanate and where 6.34 is the isocyanate content of the pre-polymer, 0.75 is the desired stoichiometry of the mixture, 230 is the equivalent weight of the curative and 42 is the equivalent weight of the isocyanate".

It is respectfully submitted that Claim 19 is patentable over Haggis et al., Habib, Elmendorp et al., or Cain et al., in combination or individually, since the references neither describe nor suggest a "fabric product comprising at least one resin fabric piece, said resin fabric

piece comprising: a resin impregnated fabric layer having a resin impregnated therein; a first resin layer having a resin disposed on a first side of said resin impregnated fabric layer; and a second resin layer having a resin disposed on a second side of said resin impregnated fabric layer, wherein the resin is derived from a mixture comprising: a pre-polymer; a co-reactant curative; and a diluent, said diluent solvating the mixture of said pre-polymer and said curative, and wherein said impregnation compound has a curative stoichiometry range of less than 85 percent".

Dependent Claim 20 adds the limitation "wherein said resin has a curative stoichiometry range of approximately 75 percent" to claim a further patentably distinct feature of the invention.

Dependent Claim 21 adds a further patentably distinct feature of the invention reciting "wherein said resin has a ratio of said curative to said pre-polymer in accordance with the formula $\frac{6.34 \times 0.75 \times 230}{42}$ = parts by weight of curative per 100 parts of pre-polymer where the pre-polymer comprises an isocyanate and where 6.34 is the isocyanate content of the pre-polymer, 0.75 is the desired stoichiometry of the mixture, 230 is the equivalent weight of the curative and 42 is the equivalent weight of the isocyanate".

Claim 22 depends from and thus include the limitations of Claim 19. Thus, Applicants submit that Claim 22 is patentably distinct over the cited reference at least for the reasons discussed above in conjunction with Claim 19.

Applicants have submitted herewith a Petition for an Extension of Time for three months with a check to cover the costs of the petition. Authorization to charge Daly, Crowley & Mofford, LLP Deposit Account No. 50-0845 for any excess fees due or credit any overpayment is hereby given.

The Examiner is respectfully invited to telephone the undersigning attorney if there are any questions regarding this Response or this application.

The Assistant Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of any additional fees associated with this communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0845, including but not limited to, any charges for extensions of time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136.

Accordingly, re-examination and reconsideration are requested in view of the above amendment and remarks.

Dated: 15 May 2006

Respectfully submitted,

DALY, CROWLEY, MOFFORD & DURKEE, LLP

By: 
Donald F. Mofford
Reg. No. 33,740
Attorney for Applicant(s)
354A Turnpike Street - Suite 301A
Canton, MA 02021-2714
Tel.: (781) 401-9988, Ext. 13
Fax: (781) 401-9966
dfm@dc-m.com